

CITY OF REGINA
PLANNING DEPARTMENT

A TOURISM STUDY FOR REGINA

DECEMBER, 1982

HLA

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
SUMMARY AND RECOMMENDATIONS	i
1.0 INTRODUCTION	1
1.1 Background	2
2.0 STUDY BACKGROUND	4
2.1 Survey Methodology	4
2.2 Weighting Methodology	5
3.0 SURVEY RESULTS	9
3.1 Trip Purpose	10
3.2 Origin and Destination of Visitors	12
3.3 Tourist Facilities	17
3.4 Tourist Attractions	23
3.5 Tourist Information Sources	29
3.6 Accommodation	31
3.7 Prior Trips	32
3.8 Time Spent in Regina	34
3.9 Information on Non-Visitors	37
3.10 Trip Expenditures	40
3.11 Visitor Demographic Information	43

SURVEY QUESTIONNAIRE

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS

SUMMARY AND RECOMMENDATIONS

1. A total of 1,151 visitors were personally interviewed this summer of which 671 were motor vehicle travellers, 256 were airplane travellers and 199 were bus travellers.
2. Just over half the visitors were travelling primarily for pleasure or holiday, 27.2% were mainly visiting family and friends and 16.3% were on business.
3. Sixty percent of visitors planned to spend some time visiting family and friends. Sightseeing and shopping were other highly popular activities.
4. Almost 30% of visitors came from three cities - Winnipeg, Calgary and Edmonton, and two thirds of visitors were urban residents.
5. Most visitors came from Western Canada and almost as many Alberta residents as Saskatchewan residents visited the City. The implications of this are that Saskatchewan residents make very few trips to Regina compared to trips to other areas of the province and Regina's proportionate share of Saskatchewan visitor trips appears to be continuing to decline.
6. Regina also attracts less U.S. and other foreign visitors than other parts of Canada.
7. The City is a primary destination area for only 38.4% of those surveyed, with 61.6% of visitors passing through to other destination areas.
8. Cost of accommodation and restaurants is rated poorly compared to quality and variety of accommodation and restaurants.
9. Museums, art galleries and recreation facilities are rated highly although the quality of these facilities is better than the variety.

10. Shopping facilities are generally highly rated.
11. Hospitality and courtesy of the City is rated much higher than the tourist facilities in general. The City's people were felt to be very helpful and friendly.
12. Facilities receiving poor ratings were the major transportation facilities: road and highways, the airport and the bus terminal. The last two of these facilities obtained very poor ratings.
13. Tourist information is difficult to find for one in ten visitors and almost one in five visitors queried felt the City's information booths were hard to find.
14. Over 20% of visitors felt downtown parking was inadequate and only about 25% felt it to be sufficient.
15. The City attractions visited most frequently are: the Downtown, the shopping facilities, the Legislative Building, RCMP Centennial Museum, Wascana Centre, and Museum of Natural History. The last four of these six facilities were rated as very good or excellent attractions.
16. Attractions with low visitation rates include the Plains Historical Museum, Trial of Louis Riel, Saskatchewan Sports Hall of Fame, Government House and the Norman MacKenzie Art Gallery. The last four of the five facilities obtained poor ratings when visitors were asked to rate the facility quality.
17. Downtown Regina received a high poor and undecided rating and the lowest excellent rating.
18. Most tourist when asked why they did not visit an attraction stated they had no time. One in five visitors did not know about the following facilities: Plains Historical Museum, SPC Observation Deck, Willow Island, Government House, the Sports Hall of Fame and Ipsco Animal Park.

19. The major source of tourist information about Regina was family and friends.
20. Hotels, motels and inns were the accommodation type used most often, followed closely by the homes of friends or relatives.
21. For about 30% of all visitors, this was their first trip to Regina. The average number of days spent in the City was one and the average number of nights was zero.
22. Lack of time was the most frequently cited reason for visitors not spending any time in the City. If this factor was removed, 41% would spend some time in Regina.
23. Perceptions of those who had not visited the City before illustrated they often felt there was little to do and few places to visit.
24. Of those spending money in Regina, the average expenditure range was \$101 to \$250. An average of about \$25 was spent by those who did not stay at least one night in Regina compared to an average between \$101 and \$250 for those spending one night in the City. The major expenditure category was for accommodation.
25. Average visitor party size was two people, and consisted primarily of families. The age distribution of travellers in the survey is similar to that for other surveys.

Based on the summary above, the following recommendations are made:

1. The visitor market potential appears to be greatest for attracting other Saskatchewan residents, based on their low visitation rates and the costs involved in promotion and advertising. Further research is required on the best means of tapping this potential in general and for the special events held in Regina.

2. The second priority for increasing visitation to Regina should be the American (U.S.A.) market. The Western Canadian market is being well served and the potential for more tourism is greater south of the border than in Western Canada.
3. Transportation facilities require upgrading. In order of priority these facilities are: the bus terminal, airport and roads and highways.
4. Regina residents should be informed about the City's visitor attractions as they are the primary source of visitor information. The City's tourist information booths should be placed in more visible locations.
5. Tourist attractions with low visitation rates often require upgrading as well as more promotion and advertising. A program to enhance these attractions is required.
6. Further research analysis on the poor ratings received by the Downtown is required. Included in an examination of the poor ratings should be how parking can be made easier for visitors.
7. Perceptions about poor tourist facilities in general, and Regina being a place with little to do and few attractions to visit requires enhancing of the City's attributes and attractions as well as an information/education program.
8. Given the large increase in expenditures which occurs when visitors spent at least one night in Regina, the focus of a marketing plan should be to increase the proportion of visitors who spend time in the City, not simply to increase the number of visitors.
9. The water quality should be improved as many visitors commented negatively about this.

10. Further analysis of the data generated from this survey should be undertaken to ensure it is utilized to its fullest; for example a detailed socio-economic profile of visitors versus those passing through the City would be useful.

REGINA TOURISM STUDY

1.0 INTRODUCTION

The City of Regina Planning Department conducted a survey of tourism in Regina in the summer of 1982 to provide a general overview of visitors to the City. The undertaking of a tourism study by the City is an innovative endeavour for a municipality as little research on tourism in Canadian cities has been conducted. The survey purpose was to provide data for a first step into the research, planning and marketing of tourism in Regina.

Tourists passing through Regina were surveyed to obtain a profile of the visitors to the City and its tourist facilities, information on the types of activities in which visitors engage, and their expenditure patterns. Specifically, the objectives were to obtain the following information on visitors to Regina:

- a profile of who visits the City, including information on visitor demographics, place of origin, party size
- information on tourist trip plans, such as ultimate trip destination, mode of travel, accommodation type, length of trip in terms of days, length of stay in Regina, purpose of trip
- ratings of attitudes and perceptions towards Regina
- activities in which visitors engage while in Regina, including places frequented
- expenditure levels and patterns while in the City.

The survey information collected in this tourism study will aid the City in assessing and understanding how well Regina is satisfying its present visitor market and will help plan how to increase the tourism potential of the City. The information can be used by the City Planning Department and others involved in tourism to assist in the following:

- the marketing of existing facilities and services to increase their use by visitors
- planning improvements to existing visitor facilities and services, and identifying the City's strengths and weaknesses vis a vis tourism
- identifying additional required tourist facilities and services to increase tourism potential
- providing indications on the importance of tourism to the City's economy and identify which sectors of the economy benefit most from this expenditure
- obtaining a profile of visitors to the City and those not visiting the City. The latter can be obtained by comparing demographic profiles of visitors to Regina to profiles of tourists in general
- develop a strategy for future research on tourism in the City.

1.1 Background

In proportionate terms, Saskatchewan residents travel a significant amount. The province's residents make up 4% of the Canadian population, yet they take 7% of total person-trips within Canada and spend 6.5% of total Canadian tourist expenditures.¹ Some of these trips are made within Saskatchewan, and some extend beyond the province's borders. About three quarters of weekend trips are within the province, but the majority of holiday trips are out-of-province trips.²

Tourism can provide significant economic benefits to regions experiencing a positive net flow of visitors. Saskatchewan is the province of destination in about 6.5% of all person-trips. The province's proportionate share of Canadian vacation trips has remained constant since the early 1970's. Current Statistics Canada data indicate that the province experiences a negative net flow of tourists, meaning a greater number of Saskatchewan residents travel outside of the province than the number of non-Saskatchewan

¹ Statistics Canada, Catalogue 87-401, *Travel, Tourism and Outdoor Recreation*.

² *Ibid.*

residents travelling to Saskatchewan. Half of Canada's provinces experience a negative net flow of visitors, and that of Saskatchewan is not high when compared to that experienced by other provinces.

Of those Canadian residents taking trips to or within Saskatchewan, Regina is the destination for 15%.¹ The proportion of visitors with Regina as their destination seems to be declining over time. Saskatchewan tourism regions attracting more visitors than Regina include the East Central region, West Central region and Saskatoon.

If Regina is to attract a greater share of visitors, a marketing plan to attract these visitors and ensure their stay is pleasant and eventful is required. A survey of visitors to Regina will provide the background information for a tourism marketing plan.

¹ *Ibid.*

2.0 STUDY BACKGROUND

2.1 Survey Methodology

A survey questionnaire, designed in consultation with the City of Regina Planning Department, was constructed to obtain the desired information on visitors to Regina.

The definition of a tourist or visitor was a person on a trip going to a place 80 km (50 miles) or more from home and then returning. Trips did not include commuting to work or school, trips as a member of an operating crew of a bus, plane, truck, etc., or moving to a new residence. The rationale for using this definition was to allow comparability of data between Statistics Canada sources and that generated by the survey.

A pretest of the questionnaire took place between August 5 and 7th. The interviewing was conducted by trained interviewers between August 11 and 20th through personal interviews with the respondents. A copy of the questionnaire is in Appendix I.

The primary purpose of the survey was to interview visitors as they were leaving the City. Initially interviewers were stationed at given exit points from the City for three travel modes: motor vehicle, air and bus, as well as at the RCMP Centennial Museum and the Scarth Street Mall entrance to the Cornwall Centre. The last of these locations was dropped soon after the start of the survey as interviewing at this location proved very unproductive and a perusal of completed interviews from the other survey locations showed that information about the downtown was being obtained. The train station was then included as the substitute location.

The survey locations were:

- service stations located at the north end of Albert Street (highways 6 and 11 North), the south end of Albert Street (highways 1 West and 6 South), and the east end of Victoria Avenue (highway 1 East)

- the airport terminal
- the bus terminal
- the train station (for the latter part of the survey)
- the RCMP Centennial Museum
- Scarth Street Mall entrance to Cornwall Centre (for the early part of the survey).

Secondary information sources show over 90% of tourists travel by motor vehicle, about 4% by airplane, 3% by bus and 1% by train. As it was desirable that the survey sample size be structured so that the data could be analyzed by travel mode, it was not valid to have a proportionate sampling design. The number of responses provided with, for example, the data on bus travellers would result in very low precision levels if proportionate sampling was used. Thus the sampling design was non-proportionate, with different calculated sample sizes for each travel mode.

The number of visitors by travel mode and by interview location are shown in Tables 1 and 2. A total of 1,151 completions were obtained, with 671 of these from motor vehicle travellers, 256 from airplane travellers, 199 from bus travellers and 25 from train travellers.

The refusal rate based on those visitors who were approached was 17%, for a completion rate of 83%. The reasons for refusal can be categorized into two areas: lack of time and not interested. Fifteen of the 17% refusal rate is accounted for by a lack of time and the remaining 2% by lack of interest. The completion rate for this survey is very high. One problem encountered in the survey occurred at the airport, bus and train stations when passengers being interviewed were called to the departure gate during the interview and thus did not answer all survey questions.

2.2 Weighting Methodology

As discussed above, the sampling design for the Regina Tourism Survey permitted the results for each travel mode to be examined separately and ensured a reasonable level of precision for these disaggregated results. If, however, the overall pattern of tourism is to be examined, the information generated for each travel mode must be weighted. For example, before

TABLE 1
SURVEY LOCATIONS FOR REGINA TOURISM SURVEY

Location	Number of Respondents	Percent of Respondents
Train Station	32	2.8
RCMP Museum	97	8.4
Airport	244	21.2
Bus Station	194	16.9
Major Roadways	578	50.2
Other	<u>6</u>	<u>0.5</u>
Total	<u>1,151</u>	<u>100.0</u>

TABLE 2
MODE OF TRAVEL TO REGINA

Travel Mode	Number of Respondents	Percent of Respondents
Motor Vehicle	671	58.3
Bus	199	17.3
Airplane	256	22.2
Train	<u>25</u>	<u>2.2</u>
Total	<u>1,151</u>	<u>100.0</u>

an accurate estimate of the total proportion of visitors staying in hotels can be derived, the data on the proportion of visitors staying in hotels and travelling by air and other travel modes must be weighted to reflect the proportion of air travellers and other travellers. Without weighting, the aggregation of information with a non-proportionate sample will be heavily biased. In the case of this survey the bias would be towards airplane and bus users.

To obtain the weights that will provide accurate aggregate results on tourism in Regina and using secondary data sources, the methodology below was employed:

1. Travel mode for four categories by visitor resident status (Canadian, U.S.A., or Other) was obtained.
2. The proportion of travel in Canada by visitor resident status was estimated.
3. A cross-tabulation of 1 and 2 above provided the weighted proportion of travellers for each travel mode.
4. The absolute frequencies for each variable of the survey within each travel mode were multiplied by the weights and new percentages were calculated based on this.

The assumptions underlying the use of this weighting methodology include the following:

- the distribution of person-trips in Saskatchewan by resident status is the same as that for Canada
- travel modes for Saskatchewan residents travelling in the province are the same as for visitors entering Saskatchewan
- estimates of U.S.A. travellers are based on the number entering Saskatchewan via the U.S.A., although some visitors will have entered Saskatchewan via another Canadian province.

TABLE 3
OUTLINE OF WEIGHTING METHODOLOGY

1. Travel Mode by Resident Status¹

Mode	Canadian Residents	U.S.A. Residents	Other Foreign Residents
Motor Vehicle	92.2	93.9	99.4
Airplane	4.0	2.4	0.6
Bus	3.0	2.3	-
Train/Other	0.9	1.4	-
	<u>100.0</u>	<u>100.0</u>	<u>100.0</u>

¹ Person-trips into Saskatchewan in 1980.

2. Travel in Canada

	<u>Person Trips</u>
Canadian Residents	73.2
U.S.A. Residents	25.4
Other Foreign	1.5
	<u>100.0</u>

3. Cross tabulation of A and B above to obtain weighted average of Mode of Travel by Resident Status.

	<u>Motor Vehicle</u>	<u>Airplane</u>	<u>Bus</u>	<u>Train/Other</u>	<u>Total</u>
Canadian Residents	67.5	2.9	2.2	0.6	
U.S.A. Residents	23.9	0.6	0.6	0.4	
Other Foreign	1.5	0.0	0.0	0.0	
	<u>92.9</u>	<u>3.5</u>	<u>2.8</u>	<u>0.9</u>	= 100.0
Weights					

Sources: Statistics Canada; Canadian Travel Survey 1980; CTS Research Bulletin No. 10.
 Statistics Canada; Travel Between Canada and Other Countries 1980; Catalogue 66-001.
 Statistics Canada; Travel in Canada 1980; Catalogue 87-504.

3.0 SURVEY RESULTS

The results presented below are aggregate results to the survey questions which have been derived by applying the weights discussed in Section 2.2 above. As such, the tables below provide an unbiased estimate of frequency distributions.¹

Comparisons of the results of this survey with other similar surveys are made wherever possible to enable the results to be put into perspective. Comparisons are made with the following studies:

- Statistics Canada; Canadian Travel Survey; Catalogue 87-504 and various Canadian Government Office of Tourism C.T.S. Research Bulletins for updates of this survey
- Statistics Canada; Travel, Tourism and Outdoor Recreation; Catalogue 87-401
- Statistics Canada; Travel Between Canada and Other Countries; Catalogue 66-001
- Transport Canada; Summer Travel by Canadians, 1980
- National Capital Commission; Tourism Survey for the National Capital Region, 1979.

The economic recession in the summer of 1982 undoubtedly affected travel and tourism and although the effect of this is not certain it should be kept in mind.

A copy of the survey questionnaire is included at the end of this report as well as in the Regina Tourism Study Appendices. The additional comments provided by the visitors, cross-tabulations of survey results by travel mode and other selected tables are provided in the Appendices.

¹ Train travellers are not discussed given the small number of completions from this travel mode.

3.1 Trip Purpose

Respondents to the survey were asked about the main purpose of their trip. Just over half replied it was for pleasure or holiday, 27.2% indicated they were visiting family or friends, 16.3% indicated business reasons and almost 4% had other reasons. Medical appointments were important in this 'other' category. These results are similar to those obtained for Saskatchewan as a whole,¹ although slightly more (3%) of the respondents to the Regina survey were travelling for pleasure and holiday or other reasons, and less (4.7%) were travelling primarily to visit family or friends.

Whereas those travelling for pleasure were about five times as likely to be using the motor vehicle mode of transport, visitors whose main trip purpose was to visit family or friends were only twice as likely to be travelling by motor vehicle than by other travel modes. Business travel was undertaken by motor vehicle (42.1%), airplane (35.8%), and bus (20.9%).

The survey respondents were queried about the activities they intended to do on this trip and answers to this question indicated the multiple objectives of the trips. Although just over one quarter of the visitors stated that visiting friends and relatives was the main purpose of their trip, 60% indicated it was one of the activities planned during their trip. Sightseeing was a frequently cited activity, followed in popularity by shopping, with participation rates of 48.3% and 24.7% respectively. About one fifth of visitors indicated they would conduct some business while on their trip. Participation in sport or outdoor activity, including camping was a popular activity, with higher participation rates than attending cultural/entertainment events or sport events. This corroborates other research² which indicates visiting friends and relatives and sightseeing are the most popular tourist activities.

¹ CGOT, CTS Research Bulletin No. 12; Canadian Travel Survey.

² Canada's Capital Visitors and Convention Bureau, Tourism The Renewable Resource. Survey of National Capital Region, 1979.

TABLE 4

"Which one of the following best describes the
main purpose of your trip?"

Purpose	Percent of Visitors
Pleasure/holiday	52.8
Business	16.3
Visit family or friends	27.2
Other	3.8
Total	<u>100.0</u>

TABLE 5

"What are you planning to do on this trip?"

Activities	Percent of Visitors
Business	19.9
Convention	3.2
Shopping	24.7
Sightseeing	48.3
Personal	5.9
Visit friends/relatives	60.0
Attend cultural/entertainment event	5.4
Attend sport event	1.9
Participation in sport or outdoor activities	7.5
Other/Don't Know	1.6

Note: Estimates of visitor percentages were calculated by weighting the survey responses for each travel mode to reflect the mode's proportion of overall tourist travel.

3.2 Origin and Destination of Visitors

Tables 6 to 8 show the place of origin of visitors surveyed, including both those staying in Regina and those passing through the City. Almost 30% of visitors came from three cities; about 13% from Winnipeg, 9% from Calgary and 6% from Edmonton. Two thirds of the visitors were urban residents with 60% from Canadian cities and 6.3% from cities in the United States. The greatest proportion of tourists, over 70%, originated in Western Canada with almost as many Alberta residents as Saskatchewan residents visiting the City. Manitoba, the other province flanking Saskatchewan, accounted for 18% of visitors.

A comparison of the above with the Canadian Travel Survey estimated origin of visitors to Saskatchewan¹ is interesting. It must be noted that the data are not strictly comparable for two reasons: a) one survey focuses on Regina while the other encompasses all of Saskatchewan, b) the Regina survey data includes those passing through the City while the Canadian Travel Survey data only includes those for whom Saskatchewan is the primary destination. The Canadian Travel Survey shows a substantially higher proportion of Saskatchewan residents (79.9%) travelling within the province than the Regina study. The difference between the two estimates can, in part be accounted for by the exclusion of the residents of the City of Regina, Moose Jaw and towns within 80 km of Regina which make up between 20 to 25% of the provincial population. Another important explanatory factor is traditionally weak performance of Regina in attracting tourists. For instance in the summer of 1980 Regina attracted only 13%² of the total Saskatchewan person-trips.

Residents of the United States contributed almost 14% of the total visitors to Regina while Western Europe and Great Britain contributed another 2.4%.

Those most likely to travel by motor vehicle are visitors from Alberta and Manitoba. Bus travel was used by a proportionately high number of Saskatchewan

¹ CGOT, CTS Research Bulletin No. 12; Canadian Travel Survey.

² Statistics Canada, Canadian Travel Survey, Catalogue 87-504 pg. 56.

residents and a proportionately high number of British Columbia, Ontario and Quebec residents arrived by air. Most U.S. visitors arrived in the City by either motor vehicle or bus.

Regina was the primary destination for 38.4% of the visitors while other Saskatchewan cities and towns were noted as destination areas for 15.6% of visitors. The four western Canadian provinces were destination points for a total of 87.9% of visitors and the rest of Canada was for 6.9%.

In the National Capital Region Survey, the Region was the primary destination area for 61.5% of those surveyed, which is substantially higher than the comparable Regina results.

TABLE 6
CITY OR TOWN OF ORIGIN OF VISITORS

City/Town	Percent of Visitors
Toronto	2.5
Winnipeg	12.9
Calgary	9.1
Edmonton	5.7
Vancouver	4.1
Saskatoon	5.2
Other Canadian Cities	19.8
U.S. Cities	6.3
U.S. Towns	7.5
Other ¹	27.0
Total	100.0

¹ Includes Canadian towns and all other places or origin not listed above.

TABLE 7
PROVINCE OR STATE OF ORIGIN OF VISITORS

Province/State	Percent of Visitors
British Columbia	10.4
Alberta	22.0
Saskatchewan	22.5
Manitoba	18.0
Ontario	8.7
Quebec	1.6
Atlantic Provinces	1.1
California	1.8
Minnesota	1.9
Montana	1.8
North Dakota	1.6
Other	7.6
Total	100.0

Note: Estimates of visitor percentages were calculated by weighting the survey responses for each travel mode to reflect the mode's proportion of overall tourist travel.

TABLE 8
COUNTRY OF ORIGIN OF VISITORS

Country	Percent of Visitors
Canada	83.5
United States	13.7
West Europe	1.6
Great Britain	0.8
Australia	-
Central and South America	0.2
East Europe	-
Tropical Islands	0.3
Total	<u>100.0</u>

TABLE 9
CITY OR TOWN OF DESTINATION OF VISITORS

City/Town	Percent of Visitors
Regina	38.4
Vancouver	5.3
Edmonton	2.6
Calgary	3.9
Winnipeg	7.9
Toronto	1.5
Saskatoon	4.0
Estavan	1.0
Rocky Mountains	4.7
Other Canadian Cities	10.9
U.S. Cities or Towns	4.3
Other	15.5
Total	<u>100.0</u>

Note: Estimates of visitor percentages were calculated by weighting the survey responses for each travel mode to reflect the mode's proportion of overall tourist travel.

TABLE 10
PROVINCE OR STATE OF DESTINATION OF VISITORS

Province/State	Percent of Visitors
British Columbia	10.6
Alberta	12.8
Saskatchewan	54.0
Manitoba	10.5
Ontario	3.6
Quebec	1.4
Atlantic Provinces	1.4
Northern Canada	0.5
Washington	0.8
Montana	0.9
Alaska	0.6
Other	2.9
Total	<u>100.0</u>

Note: Estimates of visitor percentages were calculated by weighting the survey responses for each travel mode to reflect the mode's proportion of overall tourist travel.

3.3 Tourist Facilities

The questions on tourist facilities were asked of survey respondents who had spent time in the City this trip or had visited the City this trip or had visited the City previously. These visitors were asked to rate tourist facilities on a scale of 1 to 5, with 5 being excellent and 1 being poor. Table 11 shows the results.

The 'don't know' category is of interest because it provides a feel for the proportion of visitors who have not used the facility. Ignoring the don't know category, however, provides a more precise estimation of the ratings. This is done below. Ratings of 4 and 5 are considered good, 1 and 2 are poor, and 3 is indifferent or ambivalent.

The first series of questions, centering on accommodation, were not asked of those people staying with family or friends. The quality of accommodation was generally highly rated, with 78% of those providing a rating giving a good or excellent rating and only 3% giving a poor rating (i.e. 1 or 2). Most visitors (73.5%) felt the variety of accommodation was good and only 4% of visitors felt it was poor. Concerning the cost of accommodation, only just better than half the visitors felt it was good and almost 10% gave this a poor rating. Cost, however, is more likely than the other factors to receive a poor rating.

Ratings of accommodation tended to be higher among airplane and motor vehicle travellers than among those travelling by bus.

The proportion of visitors rating the quality and variety of restaurants as good was close to 75%. The cost factor was again rated more harshly; just over half the visitors felt the cost of restaurants was good or excellent and about 8% rated this as poor.

Ratings of restaurants did not vary significantly among the users of different travel modes.

About three quarters of the tourists responding to the survey rated as good both the museums/art galleries and the City's recreation facilities. The quality of museums and art galleries was rated slightly higher than the variety of these facilities. Bus travellers tended to give a slightly more favourable rating of these facilities than did those travelling by other transportation modes.

When queried about the variety of shopping facilities almost 80% of visitors replied they were excellent and only 4.3% felt they were poor.

Tourist facilities in general received a positive rating from three quarters of visitors, but they received a poor rating from 9% of visitors which is higher than the poor ratings received for the specific categories above. On the other hand, hospitality and courtesy in general received a very high good rating (86.5%) and a low poor rating. Airplane travellers were more inclined to give high ratings to hospitality than the other types of travellers.

Visitors were also asked to rate major transportation facilities: roads and highways, the airport and the bus terminal. Roads and highways received few 'don't know' responses and a higher overall negative rating than the previously mentioned facilities. Almost 13% of visitors felt the roads were poor and only 65% felt they were good or excellent. Only one half of visitors rated the airport positively and one quarter gave it a poor rating. The question concerning the bus terminal received the highest 'don't know' response reflecting the lower popularity of this travel mode compared to the automobile and airplane. A total of 61.1% rated the bus terminal as poor or very poor and only 21.8% felt it was good.

Airplane travellers gave higher good and poor ratings of the airport than did bus or motor vehicle travellers, and likewise bus travellers gave higher good and poor ratings of the bus terminal than did those using other means of transportation. This is what would be expected as users of the transportation facility would be less likely to be ambivalent or indifferent to it.

The bus terminal in particular and transportation facilities in general received the poorest ratings of all the tourist facilities.

Principal complaints about the airport concerned it's size. The bus station was also thought to be too small and complaints about its rather sleazy atmosphere were frequent.

An additional question was asked on tourist facilities in general. In this question a statement was read and the visitor was asked how he would rate the statement on a scale of 1 to 5, with 5 being strongly agree and 1 being strongly disagree. Again in this question the proportion of 'don't know' responses is significant as it can provide a rough measure of non-use of a facility. The don't know response has been eliminated for the analysis below.

Although quite a high proportion of visitors felt tourist information is easy to get, almost one in ten visitors felt it was difficult to obtain. It appears that tourist information is often obtained from sources other than tourist information booths as 17% of visitors giving an opinion to this statement stated the booths were difficult to find and just over one half of all the responses to this question were 'don't know'. Bus travellers had the most problem locating the information booths.

Generally speaking, visitors thought it was easy to find their way around the City. Of those who travelled by bus, a high proportion thought it was difficult to find their way around. Parking was a problem for many tourists as 22.9% of visitors perceived it as inadequate and only 26.6% felt it to be sufficient.

The question concerning public washrooms downtown received a very high proportion of 'don't know' responses (75%). Of those who did express an opinion, half felt there were enough washroom facilities and one quarter felt these facilities were inadequate.

The vast majority of visitors (85.7%) felt that the people of Regina were helpful; furthermore, most (86.9%) indicated that they would visit the City another time. The hospitality and friendliness of the citizens of Regina appear to be a key asset of the City.

TABLE 11

"On a scale of 1 to 5, with 5 being excellent and 1 being poor, how would you rate the following?"

Facilities	Rating					Don't Know	Total
	1	2	3	4	5		
Quality of Accommodation	0.2	1.6	11.0	21.8	23.8	41.7	100.0
Variety of Accommodation	1.0	1.2	11.8	18.4	20.4	47.2	100.0
Cost of Accommodation	2.4	2.8	20.2	17.4	12.8	44.4	100.0
Quality of Restaurants	1.2	2.6	17.2	30.5	23.1	25.5	100.0
Variety of Restaurants	0.6	2.4	13.6	24.3	28.5	30.7	100.0
Cost of Restaurants	2.2	3.4	29.2	24.4	12.4	28.4	100.0
Variety of Museums/ Art Galleries	0.2	1.4	9.0	16.0	16.8	56.6	100.0
Quality of Museums/ Art Galleries	-	0.8	6.2	17.6	19.8	55.6	100.0
Variety of Recreation Facilities	0.8	2.0	7.8	15.3	13.5	60.6	100.0
Quality of Recreation Facilities	0.2	1.4	8.8	15.2	13.6	60.8	100.0
Variety of Shopping Facilities	1.0	1.8	11.4	26.6	26.0	33.2	100.0
Tourist Facilities in General	1.0	4.0	11.7	23.5	23.3	36.6	100.0
Hospitality and Courtesy in General	1.2	2.0	9.0	31.2	47.2	9.4	100.0
Road/Highways	5.0	7.4	21.2	31.8	31.0	3.6	100.0
Airport	3.6	7.0	9.8	12.0	7.8	59.7	100.0
Bus Terminal	11.0	5.8	4.8	4.0	2.0	72.5	100.0

Note: Estimates of visitor percentages were calculated by weighting the survey responses for each travel mode to reflect the mode's proportion of overall tourist travel.

TABLE 12

EXPLANATION OF SELECTED POOR RATINGS

	Number of Respondents
Airport too small	86
Bad roads: bumpy and potholes	52
Bus station too small	31
Bus station dirty and sleazy	47

TABLE 13

"How would you rate the following statements on a scale of 1 to 5, with 5 being strongly agree and 1 being strongly disagree?"

Statement	Disagree				Agree		Don't Know	Total
	1	2	3	4	5			
Tourist information is easy to get	2.4	2.5	8.3	13.5	23.2	50.2		100.0
Tourist information booths are easy to find	4.6	3.5	10.8	10.4	17.7	53.1		100.0
It is easy to find my way around the City	1.9	3.0	10.7	18.5	38.6	27.4		100.0
There is enough parking downtown	8.6	8.0	14.4	9.7	9.6	49.8		100.0
There are enough public washrooms downtown	4.2	2.5	5.5	6.4	6.3	75.0		100.0
The people of Regina are helpful to visitors	0.9	1.6	7.0	21.3	35.5	33.7		100.0
I plan to visit Regina again	1.1	0.6	8.0	9.3	54.3	26.8		100.0

Note: Estimates of visitor percentages were calculated by weighting the survey responses for each travel mode to reflect the mode's proportion of overall tourist travel.

3.4 Tourist Attractions

People that spent some time on this trip in Regina or had previously spent time in Regina were asked a number of questions about specific tourist attractions: had they visited the attraction, if so how would they rate it, if not why hadn't they visited the attraction.

The most frequently visited attractions were the Downtown and the City's shopping facilities, with 67.2% and 60.7% visitation respectively. The Legislative Building was a popular place to visit (49.9%) as was the RCMP Centennial Museum (47.0%), Wascana Centre (43.4%) and the Museum of Natural History (40.0%). The Qu'Appelle Valley, located outside of the City was frequented by 41.7% of visitors.

Those facilities with low visitation rates include the Plains Historical Museum (7.3%), the Trial of Louis Riel (8.2%), the Saskatchewan Sports Hall of Fame (8.9%), Government House (9.7%) and the Norman MacKenzie Art Gallery.

Overall these participation or visitation rates compare favourably to those obtained in other cities. In the Ottawa tourism survey the results showed 73% of visitors touring Parliament Hill¹, but only about 40% saw the City's other popular attractions. Travel Alberta studies estimate that only 21% of visitors to Alberta² attend special events and attractions of the sort noted in the Regina survey question. Nonetheless the low visitation rates for some Regina facilities can be improved.

Tourists who had visited a facility were asked to rate the facility on a scale of 1 to 5, with 5 being excellent and 1 being poor. Facilities which received excellent ratings (i.e. a rating of 5) by over 55% of those who visited them include the RCMP Centennial Museum, Saskatchewan Roughrider games, the Trial of Louis Riel and the Museum of Natural History. Between

¹ *Canada's Capital Visitors and Convention Bureau; Tourism The Renewable Resource. Survey of National Capital Region, 1979.*

² *Travel Alberta Cordon Studies.*

TABLE 14

"Which of the following have you visited either
on this trip or previously?"

	Yes	No	Total
RCMP Centennial Museum	47.0	53.0	100.0
Museum of Natural History	40.0	60.0	100.0
Norman MacKenzie Art Gallery	10.7	89.3	100.0
Plains Historical Museum	7.3	92.7	100.0
SPC Observation Deck	12.2	87.9	100.0
Wascana Centre	43.4	56.5	100.0
Diefenbaker Homestead	22.3	77.7	100.0
Willow Island	13.6	86.4	100.0
Legislative Building	49.9	50.1	100.0
Saskatchewan Sports Hall of Fame	8.9	91.1	100.0
Government House	9.7	90.3	100.0
Downtown Regina	67.2	32.8	100.0
Saskatchewan Roughrider Game	22.7	77.3	100.0
Trial of Louis Riel	8.2	91.9	100.0
Ipsco Animal Park	16.1	83.9	100.0
Saskatchewan Centre of the Arts	25.4	74.6	100.0
Shopping	60.7	39.3	100.0
Swimming Pools	20.7	79.3	100.0
Picnic Areas	29.5	70.5	100.0
Qu'Appelle Valley	41.7	58.3	100.0
Regina Beach	21.6	78.4	100.0

Note: Estimates of visitor percentages were calculated by weighting the survey responses for each travel mode to reflect the mode's proportion of overall tourist travel.

50% and 55% of visitors rated Wascana Centre, the Qu'Appelle Valley and the Saskatchewan Centre of the Arts as excellent attractions.

Proportionately high poor ratings (i.e. a rating of 1) were obtained by the Trail of Louis Riel (9.8%), the Saskatchewan Sports Hall of Fame (6.7%) and Government House (6.1%). A significant proportion of visitors also rated Saskatchewan Roughrider games, Regina Beach, Ipsco Animal Park, Norman MacKenzie Art Gallery, and the Downtown area as poor attractions.

Two interesting notations can be made from the information above: a) those facilities with very high poor ratings also have low visitation rates; b) some facilities have both high 'poor' and 'excellent' ratings providing evidence of the polarity of opinions on some things - such as politics (the Trial of Louis Riel) and the enjoyment of spectator sports (Roughrider games). With regard to the former point, some improvements to these facilities will be required if visitation rates are to increase over the long term.

Downtown Regina is an interesting case: of all the attractions enumerated, it obtained the lowest 'excellent' rating, a high 'poor' rating, and a high 'undecided' rating.

Those survey respondents who had not visited a particular facility were asked why they had not done so. By far the most prevalent reason for not visiting the City's attractions is the visitor's lack of time for in all cases over 50% of those who did not visit a facility cited this as the main reason.

Facilities which over one fifth of respondents to this question state they are not interested in visiting are: the Norman MacKenzie Art Gallery, a Saskatchewan Roughrider game, swimming pools and picnic areas. There is likely little that can be done to induce these tourists to visit the attraction when this reason is given.

TABLE 15

"How would you rate the attractions you have visited on a scale of 1 to 5, with 5 being excellent and 1 being poor?"

Attraction	Rating					Total
	1	2	3	4	5	
RCMP Centennial Museum	0.9	1.3	13.0	21.7	63.0	100.0
Museum of Natural History	1.0	1.0	14.0	28.0	56.0	100.0
Norman MacKenzie Art Gallery	3.9	3.9	30.8	36.5	25.0	100.0
Plains Historical Museum	-	2.8	30.6	27.8	38.9	100.0
SPC Observation Deck	-	6.5	30.7	30.7	32.3	100.0
Wascana Centre	1.9	3.7	12.1	30.2	52.1	100.0
Diefenbaker Homestead	0.9	6.5	25.9	23.2	43.5	100.0
Willow Island	-	6.0	34.3	16.4	43.3	100.0
Legislative Building	1.2	3.7	18.3	34.2	42.7	100.0
Saskatchewan Sports Hall of Fame	6.7	4.4	28.9	33.3	26.7	100.0
Government House	6.1	12.2	24.5	24.5	32.7	100.0
Downtown Regina	5.1	10.2	28.0	38.9	17.8	100.0
Saskatchewan Rough-rider Game	5.4	-	13.5	21.6	59.5	100.0
Trial of Louis Riel	9.8	2.4	12.2	19.5	56.1	100.0
Ipsco Animal Park	3.9	9.0	38.5	25.6	23.1	100.0
Saskatchewan Centre of the Arts	0.8	0.8	12.7	34.9	50.8	100.0
Shopping	2.3	2.3	30.7	38.0	26.7	100.0
Swimming Pools	2.0	7.9	25.7	39.6	24.8	100.0
Picnic Areas	2.8	0.7	18.1	44.4	34.0	100.0
Qu'Appelle Valley	1.9	1.5	15.1	29.6	51.9	100.0
Regina Beach	5.7	9.5	31.4	23.8	29.5	100.0

Note: Estimates of visitor percentages were calculated by weighting the survey responses for each travel mode to reflect the mode's proportion of overall tourist travel.

"Didn't know about it" was the reason mentioned by over 20% of those queried about non-use of the following facilities: Plains Historical Museum, S.P.C. Observation Deck, Willow Island, Government House, the Saskatchewan Sports Hall of Fame and Ipsco Animal Park. An advertising and information program could likely attract some of these visitors to the facilities.

Few respondents stated that the facility cost was so high it precluded their visitation, which is reasonable since the facilities are primarily free. Cases where cost or the inability to find the facility was indicated as the reason for non-visitation resulted from 1 or 2 respondents' answers.

TABLE 16

"Why didn't you visit these attractions?"

Reasons for not visiting:

- 1 = not interested
- 2 = didn't know about it
- 3 = no time
- 4 = costs too much
- 5 = couldn't find it
- 6 = plan to visit later
- 7 = other

	<u>Reason</u>							Total
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
RCMP Centennial Museum	17.7	11.4	58.4	0.8	0.4	10.2	1.2	100.0
Museum of Natural History	15.0	11.1	60.0	0.4	0.4	12.5	0.7	100.0
Norman MacKenzie Art Gallery	20.2	15.7	55.7	0.2	0.5	7.2	0.5	100.0
Plains Historical Museum	13.5	26.3	52.1	0.5	0.2	7.0	0.5	100.0
SPC Observation Deck	13.0	23.3	55.0	0.3	-	7.9	0.5	100.0
Wascana Centre	13.3	13.7	62.0	1.5	-	8.8	0.8	100.0
Diefenbaker Homestead	14.5	15.6	57.3	0.3	1.4	9.9	1.1	100.0
Willow Island	12.3	19.7	58.9	0.3	0.3	7.8	0.8	100.0
Legislative Building	17.1	6.4	62.8	0.9	0.4	11.5	0.9	100.0
Saskatchewan Sports Hall of Fame	18.2	17.5	56.4	0.2	0.5	6.5	0.7	100.0
Government House	18.8	18.8	54.5	0.2	0.2	6.8	0.7	100.0
Downtown Regina	12.9	4.5	71.6	0.7	-	9.0	1.3	100.0
Saskatchewan Rough-rider Game	20.7	6.2	61.2	0.6	0.3	6.5	4.5	100.0
Trial of Louis Riel	17.8	12.8	59.5	0.5	-	8.3	1.2	100.0
Ipsco Animal Park	15.1	17.9	57.7	0.3	0.3	8.3	0.5	100.0
Saskatchewan Centre of the Arts	15.5	9.6	64.4	0.9	-	8.8	0.9	100.0
Shopping	19.2	4.4	62.6	0.6	-	12.1	1.1	100.0
Swimming Pools	23.5	4.1	65.5	0.3	0.6	5.5	0.6	100.0
Picnic Areas	20.0	5.9	66.6	0.3	-	6.3	0.9	100.0
Qu'Appelle Valley	15.2	11.0	66.2	-	-	6.5	1.1	100.0
Regina Beach	17.0	11.1	64.1	-	-	6.7	1.1	100.0

Note: Estimates of visitor percentages were calculated by weighting the survey responses for each travel mode to reflect the mode's proportion of overall tourist travel.

3.5 Tourist Information Sources

The major source of tourist information about Regina was family and friends, accounting for about one third of all responses. Almost one fifth of visitors responded to this question by volunteering that they did not require information as they had lived in the City previously. Tourist information centres serviced only about 10% of the information needs. Place of business was a primary information source for 7.1% of visitors and another 5% used Travel Associations. Newspapers and magazines and place of accommodation were little used information sources. The reliance on friends and relatives as a source of information on the City was about 10% higher than that found in the 1979 Ottawa and National Capital Region tourist survey, although in both surveys this was found to be the most frequently tapped information source.

Motor vehicle travellers made use of friends and relatives, Tourist Information Centres and Travel Associations in a proportionately high degree. Family and friends most often provided information to bus travellers while airplane travellers had often previously resided in the City or obtained information from their place of employment.

TABLE 17

"From where did you get information about Regina?"

Source	Percent of Responses ¹
Lived here before	19.8
Friends/relatives	35.8
Hotel/motel/campground	1.1
Business	7.1
Tourist information centres	10.3
Travel Association	5.4
Newspapers/magazines	1.9
Other	5.7
Didn't get information	13.0
Total	100.0

¹ Respondents could select up to two responses.

TABLE 18

"What type of accommodation did you use while
in Regina?"

Accommodation Type	Percent of Visitor Parties
Home of friends/relatives	35.9
Hotel/motel/inn	39.7
Campground/trailer park	15.9
Private cabin/cottage	1.5
Commercial cabin/cottage	0.3
Other	0.9
Day trip to Regina	5.9
Total	100.0

Note: Estimates of visitor percentages were calculated by weighting the survey responses for each travel mode to reflect the mode's proportion of overall tourist travel.

3.6 Accommodation

Slightly more visitor parties stayed at hotels, motels or inns than at the homes of friends or relatives. Together these two types accounted for 75.6% of visitor party accommodation in Regina and when day trips¹ are ignored this jumps to 80%. Campgrounds and trailer parks were used by 15.9%. Little use was made of other accommodation types.

Motor vehicle travellers were the most likely to use campgrounds as would be expected, and they make slightly more use of hotels than of the homes of friends and relatives. Whereas a proportionately high number of bus travellers stay at the home of family and friends, the preferred accommodation type of airplane travellers is the hotel/motel/inn.

Comparing results of this variable to other data sources shows significant differences. For instance, a category comprising cottages and other makes up a significantly higher proportion of overall accommodation use in other studies² than it does in the Regina study, in part because there are supply constraints in Regina in terms of cottage locations and cottages. The Ottawa visitor survey is the most directly comparable study and it showed more than 50% of visitors staying in hotels/motels and inns and 26% lodged with friends and relatives. Differences between this and the Regina study results can be accounted for by such factors as the diverse as differences in out-migration rates and differences in vacancy rates in hotels/motels.

¹ Day trips here are based on visitors who are spending time in Regina or who have visited the City before.

² Statistics Canada; Canadian Travel Survey: Catalogue 87-504.

TABLE 19

"Have you visited Regina before?"

Response	Percent of Visitors
Yes	68.6
No	31.4
Total	100.0

TABLE 20

NUMBER OF TRIPS TO REGINA AND TOTAL NUMBER
OF TRIPS IN THE PAST TWELVE MONTHS

Number of Trips	To Regina	In Total
Zero	56.5	46.4
1 to 2	26.3	5.8
3 to 5	7.7	10.7
6 to 10	4.4	11.8
11 to 20	3.1	11.5
More than 20	1.9	13.8
Total	100.0	100.0

Note: Estimates of visitor percentages were calculated by weighting the survey responses for each travel mode to reflect the mode's proportion of overall tourist travel.

3.8 Time Spent in Regina

This question was asked of all survey respondents, including those who spent time in the City and those who did not. For 6.9% of visitors their trip was a day trip with the major purpose being a visit to the City. Overnight stays of seven nights or less occurred with one third of the visitors, stays of between one and two weeks occurred with 28.7% and 30.4% indicated they would be away from home for more than two weeks.

Mean trip length was 8 to 14 days for motor vehicle travellers, and 3 to 5 days for both bus and airplane travellers.

Of the total time spent on the trip in most cases only a small portion was being spent in Regina. The mean number of days spent in Regina was between 1 and 2 for all transportation modes and the mean number of nights was zero for motor vehicle and bus travellers and between 1 and 2 for airplane travellers.

Of the total visitors queried 45.7% did not stay even one day in the City and 52.8% did not stay the night. Looking at those who did spend some time in Regina, 32.2% spent 1 to 2 days and 26.6% spent to to 2 nights. A total of about 5.6% spent one week or more in the City with only 2.5% spending two or more weeks.

Most of the visitors indicated they would not be spending any additional nights in Regina. This reflects the survey methodology which attempted in most cases to focus on visitors as they were departing the City.

Compared to the Ottawa visitor survey, tourists are spending comparatively little time in Regina. Part of this can be accounted for by methodological differences; in the Ottawa study interviews were conducted primarily downtown and considerably less through traffic would have been encountered.

TABLE 21

"How many nights will you be away from home
on this trip?"

Nights	Percent of Visitors
None	6.9
1 to 2	8.0
3 to 5	15.5
6 to 7	10.5
8 to 14	28.7
15 or more	30.4
Total	100.0

TABLE 22

"How many days and nights have you spent in
Regina?"

Days	Percent of Visitors
None	45.7
1 to 2	32.2
3 to 5	13.7
6 to 7	2.8
8 to 14	3.1
15 or more	2.5
Total	100.0
<u>Nights</u>	
None	52.8
1 to 2	26.6
3 to 5	12.1
6 to 7	3.5
8 to 14	2.7
15 or more	2.4
Total	100.0

Note: Estimates of visitor percentages were calculated by weighting the survey responses for each travel mode to reflect the mode's proportion of overall tourist travel.

TABLE 23

"How many (more) nights are you planning to
spend in Regina as part of this trip?"

More Nights	Percent of Visitors
None	72.5
1 to 2	16.2
3 to 5	5.3
6 to 7	2.2
8 to 14	2.0
15 or more	1.7
Total	100.0

TABLE 24

"Why don't you plan to spend any time in Regina?"

Reason	Percent of Visitors
No time	41.5
Just passing through	37.8
Prefer elsewhere	3.2
No reason to stay	5.0
No business here	0.9
No more business here	1.4
Don't like Regina	2.3
Cheaper elsewhere	0.5
No friends or relatives here	5.0
Just staying the day	1.8
Don't know	0.9
Total	100.0

Note: Estimates of visitor percentages were calculated by weighting the survey responses for each travel mode to reflect the mode's proportion of overall tourist travel.

3.9 Information on Non-Visitors

Respondents who indicated they had not spent any time in Regina on this trip and were not planning to were asked a separate set of questions. The answers to these questions are provided below.

When asked why they were not planning to spend any time in the City, 41.5% stated their reason as lack of time, and another 37.8% said they were just passing through. Often these two responses mean the same thing: people are not stopping because they are in a hurry to either get to their destination or to get home. A total of 5% of respondents replied that they had no reason to stay and 5% had no friends or relatives in the City.

When asked if they had an extra week would they spend a portion of this time in Regina 41% replied affirmatively and 55.9% said they would spend all extra time elsewhere. The latter group were asked two additional questions: where would they spend any extra time and why wouldn't they spend time in Regina. The destinations most frequently cited as preferred locations were the Rocky Mountains (10.3%) and towns in Saskatchewan, excluding cities (9.4%). The reasons for not spending time in Regina fell basically into four categories. One third replied they would rather go elsewhere and almost another one third would rather visit friends or relatives. About 20% of these visitors replied there was more to do elsewhere and 10% preferred to remain at home.

All those interviewed who had not visited the City before and were not planning to were asked to give their perceptions of the City's tourist facilities, shopping facilities and attractions. Tourist facilities were generally ranked as good: just over 60% of those answering this question felt they would be good and only 3.2% felt they would be poor. Fifty three percent felt shopping facilities would be good and 5.6% believed they would be poor, thus, shopping was rated more poorly than tourist facilities in general. The category "places to visit and things to do" was rated poorly by 26.1% of respondents and good by about half.

TABLE 25

"If you had an extra week would you spend some of this time in Regina or would you spend it elsewhere?"

	Percent of Visitors
Regina	41.0
Elsewhere	55.9
Don't Know	3.1
Total	<u>100.0</u>

TABLE 26

"Where would you spend your extra week?"

City/Town	Percent of Visitors
Vancouver	6.0
Calgary	5.1
Saskatoon	5.1
Winnipeg	6.0
Saskatchewan Towns ¹	9.4
Northern Saskatchewan	5.9
Rocky Mountains	10.3
U.S. City or Town	6.8
Other	45.4
Total	<u>100.0</u>

¹ Excludes cities.

Note: Estimates of visitor percentages were calculated by weighting the survey responses for each travel mode to reflect the mode's proportion of overall tourist travel.

TABLE 27

"Why wouldn't you spend some extra time in Regina?"

Reason	Percent of Visitors
Rather visit friends/relatives	32.2
Rather stay home	10.1
Rather go elsewhere	33.3
More to do elsewhere	19.2
Have seen enough of Regina	4.0
Other	1.0
Total	100.0

TABLE 28

"What would you expect of Regina's tourist facilities, shopping facilities, and attractions?"

	Good	Fair	Poor	Don't Know	Total
Tourist facilities (e.g. accommodation and restaurants)	60.9	35.9	3.2	-	100.0
Shopping facilities	52.8	41.6	5.6	-	100.0
Places to visit and things to do	51.1	22.7	26.1	-	100.0

Note: Estimates of visitor percentages were calculated by weighting the survey responses for each travel mode to reflect the mode's proportion of overall tourist travel.

3.10 Trip Expenditures

Total trip expenditures were, as would be expected, higher than visitor expenditures in Regina. While in 91.7% of cases total trip expenditures exceeded \$100, expenditures in Regina were greater than \$100 in only 64.2% of cases. Spending of more than \$500 occurred for 48% of all trips and in only 12.8% of visitor expenditures in Regina.

The average expenditure range for the different travel modes were: motor vehicle travellers - \$251 to \$500; bus travellers - \$101 to \$250; airplane travellers \$500 to \$1000. This compares to the following average expenditure in Regina: motor vehicle travellers - \$101 to \$250; bus travellers - \$51 to \$100; airplane travellers \$101 to \$250.

Average total travel expenditures were highest for those travelling for pleasure (\$501 to \$1000), the same for those travelling for business or to visit family and friends (\$251 to \$500), and lowest for those in the 'other' category (\$101 to \$250). Of those spending money in Regina, the mean expenditure range was \$101 to \$250. Business travellers spent the most, followed by those travelling for pleasure and those travelling to visit family or friends.

Those visitors to Regina who did not stay over one night spent an average of \$50 or less in the City, while those between 1 and 5 nights indicated average expenditures of between \$101 and \$250. When the number of nights spent in the City totalled 6 or more, average expenditures rose to between \$251 and \$500.

If the expenditures estimated from the Ottawa survey are compared to those from this survey, even without adjusting for the general level of price increase, average tourist spendings in the national capital are higher than in Regina.

Of those spending money on accommodation in Regina, the average amount spent was between \$51 and \$100, and accommodation constituted the major expenditure category. Average expenditures on restaurants, entertainment, shopping and transportation were between \$26 and \$50. Food stores obtained the lowest average expenditures - less than \$25.

Airplane travellers, followed by motor vehicle travellers spent the most on accommodation, restaurants, recreation and transportation. Motor vehicle travellers spent more than airplane travellers and bus travellers on food store purchases, and shopping purchases.

Those travelling on business spent more on accommodation, restaurant meals and beverages, recreation and transportation than did those travelling for pleasure or to visit friends and relatives.

TABLE 29
AGGREGATE EXPENDITURE INFORMATION

Expenditure	Total Trip Expenditure	Total Regina Expenditures
	(Percent of Visitors)	(Percent of Visitors)
\$50 or less	4.0	19.6
\$51 to 100	4.3	16.2
\$101 to 250	16.8	31.5
\$251 to 500	26.9	19.9
\$501 to 1,000	22.0	8.9
\$1,001 to 2,000	14.7	2.1
\$2,001 or more	11.3	1.8
Total	100.0	100.0

TABLE 30
DISAGGREGATED EXPENDITURE INFORMATION

Expen- diture	Accomo- dation	Restau- rant	Food Stores	Enter- tainment	Shop- ping	Trans- portation
	(Percent of Visitors)					
\$25 or less	15.1	25.1	50.4	40.0	25.7	38.4
\$26 to 50	28.3	33.2	25.9	33.3	29.2	42.8
\$51 to 100	27.0	21.5	13.5	18.3	22.2	13.5
\$101 to 250	18.2	14.6	6.1	5.0	14.6	3.1
\$251 to 500	5.0	4.1	3.7	2.5	4.1	1.8
\$501 to 999	3.8	0.8	-	-	2.3	0.4
\$1000 or more	2.5	0.8	-	0.8	1.8	-
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0

Note: Estimates of visitor percentages were calculated by weighting the survey responses for each travel mode to reflect the mode's proportion of overall tourist travel.

3.11 Visitor Demographic Information

On average, visitor party size was two people with 16.8% one person parties and 36.8% two person parties. Parties made up of more than four people comprised 11.9% of the total. A comparison of these numbers to other studies shows definite differences. The Canadian Travel Survey¹ results for Saskatchewan as a whole show an average party size of one person. This study data signifies that 52.3% of parties are one person parties, 26.2% are made up of two people, and parties larger than four people total 4.3%. Travel party size in Regina is, however, very close to the estimate obtained from the Ottawa study where 13% of parties were those travelling alone and 34% consisted of two people.

Motor vehicle travellers had substantially larger party sizes compared to bus or airplane traveller party sizes and, in fact, the majority of those travelling by either bus or airplane were 1 person travel parties.

The majority of travel parties (70.3%) consisted of families. The next most frequent type of party was individuals travelling alone, but very few parties considered themselves to be primarily business associates.

Those travelling by either bus or airplane tended to be alone but motor vehicle travellers usually made their trips with family members.

The age distribution illustrates travel often involved those aged 35 to 54 years old (27.1% of total visitors) and those aged 5 to 17. Based on life cycles the latter could form part of the families of the former group. While young adults aged 25 to 34 years constituted one fifth of the total, seniors accounted for 6.1%. These estimates match very closely those done in the 1981 Canadian Travel Survey and the Ottawa Survey.

As in the other studies on tourism, the sex distribution of travellers is skewed towards males.

¹ CGOT, CTS Research Bulletin No. 12; Canadian Travel Survey.

Those occupational groups forming a large portion of the visitors in Regina in the summer of 1982 include skilled tradesmen, professionals, managers and the retired. This breakdown is consistent with information from other studies.

High levels of household income in the main characterize travellers to Regina; for instance 35% of travellers earned \$35,000 or more. Even after accounting for inflation these estimates are substantially higher than that determined in other studies.¹ The recession may have resulted in different travel patterns among those earning in the middle and lower ends of the income scales.

As would be expected the highest income levels are found among air travellers, and the lowest levels among bus travellers.

¹ *Transport Canada, Summer Travel by Canadians, 1980 showed 8.1% earning \$35,000 or more. Canada's Capital Visitors and Convention Bureau; Tourism the Renewable Resource contained a survey showing 26% of visitors earning more than \$30,000.*

TABLE 31

"How many people are in your travel party?"

Party Size	Percent of Visitors
1	16.8
2	36.8
3	15.8
4	18.7
5	8.2
6 or more	3.7
Total	<u>100.0</u>

TABLE 32

"How could your travel party best be described?"

Party Type	Percent of Visitors
Travelling alone	16.4
Family	70.3
Friends	11.1
Business Associates	1.9
Other	0.1
Total	<u>100.0</u>

Note: Estimates of visitor percentages were calculated by weighting the survey responses for each travel mode to reflect the mode's proportion of overall tourist travel.

TABLE 33AGE DISTRIBUTION OF TRAVEL PARTY MEMBERS

Age	Percent of Visitors
Less than 5	4.2
5 to 17 years	22.9
18 to 24 years	11.7
25 to 34 years	20.0
35 to 54 years	27.1
55 to 64 years	8.1
65 or older	6.1
Total	<u>100.0</u>

TABLE 34SEX DISTRIBUTION OF TRAVEL PARTY MEMBERS

Sex	Percent of Visitors
Female	48.2
Male	51.8
Total	<u>100.0</u>

Note: Estimates of visitor percentages were calculated by weighting the survey responses for each travel mode to reflect the mode's proportion of overall tourist travel.

TABLE 35

"What is the occupation of the primary wage earner in your household?"

Occupation	Percent of Visitors
Trades/skilled	12.0
Professional	19.7
Sales	7.6
Unskilled	4.7
Professional-Technical	4.9
Self-employed	5.4
Clerical	1.8
Manager	9.1
Student	1.3
Retired	10.9
Transportation	2.6
Farmer and Other Primary	4.5
Service	3.4
Police/Fire/Armed Forces	3.7
Other White Collar	3.6
Athlete	0.1
Unemployed	1.9
Don't Know/Refused	2.8
Total	100.0

Note: Estimates of visitor percentages were calculated by weighting the survey responses for each travel mode to reflect the mode's proportion of overall tourist travel.

TABLE 36

"Which of the following categories contains the total 1981 income from all members of your household before taxes and deductions?"

Category	Percent of Visitors
Under \$9,000	3.2
\$ 9,000 - 14,999	4.7
\$15,000 - 19,999	8.5
\$20,000 - 24,999	9.7
\$25,000 - 29,999	10.1
\$30,000 - 34,999	11.4
\$35,000 - 39,999	10.1
\$40,000 or more	25.1
Refused	17.2
Total	100.0

Note: Estimates of visitor percentages were calculated by weighting the survey responses for each travel mode to reflect the mode's proportion of overall tourist travel.

APPENDIX I
REGINA TOURISM STUDY
QUESTIONNAIRE

I.D. No.: _____
Location: _____
Travel Mode: _____
Date: _____

Hello. My name is _____. This summer the City of Regina is doing a tourism study. The information we collect will be used to plan improvements to the City's tourist facilities. Your answers to these questions will be kept confidential and will be released only in statistical form.

1. Where do you live?

(City/Town) (Province/State) (Country)

(If Regina, or definitely within 80 km (50 miles) of the city, thank the respondent and explain we're only interested in surveying those living 80 km or more from the city).

2. (If you are uncertain whether this is within the distance limits, ask:)

Do you live within 80 km or 50 miles of Regina?

_____ yes (thank respondent and terminate interview)

_____ no

3. What is your main trip destination?

(City/Town/Region) (Province/State)

4. Which one of the following best describes the main purpose of your trip?
(Read all reasons. Check one only)

_____ pleasure/holiday

_____ business

_____ visit family or friends

_____ other. (Specify:) _____

5. What are you planning to do on this trip? (Can check more than one.)

- _____ business
- _____ convention
- _____ shopping
- _____ sightseeing
- _____ personal
- _____ visit friends/relatives
- _____ attend cultural/entertainment event
- _____ attend sport event
- _____ participate in sport or outdoor activities
- _____ other (Specify:) _____
- _____ no other reason/don't know

6. How many nights will you be away from home on this trip?

_____ nights

7. How many days and nights have you spent in Regina? (Obtain both)

_____ days

_____ nights

8. How many (more) nights are you planning to spend in Regina as part of this trip?

_____ nights.

*(GO TO question 16 if question 7 shows they have spent at least 1 day or 1 night in Regina.)

**(OTHERWISE), if they have not spent a day or night in Regina

- (go to question 9 if answer to question 8 is 0.
- (go to question 10 if answer to question 8 is NOT ZERO)

9. Why don't you plan to spend any time in Regina? _____

10. If you had an extra week, would you spend some of this time in Regina or would you spend it elsewhere? (Where?) _____

11. Have you visited the City before?

_____ yes (go to question 13)

_____ no (go to question 12)

12. I am going to ask your opinions on some Regina facilities. I know you haven't visited the city before but we are interested in your expectations and perceptions of Regina.

a. What would you expect of Regina's tourist facilities (accommodation, restaurants)? _____

b. Regina's shopping facilities? _____

c. Places to visit and things to do in Regina? _____

**** GO TO QUESTION 28**

13. (READ THIS, THEN GIVE RESPONDENT NEXT PAGE TO FILL IN).

I am going to show you a list of attractions. Please answer the following questions.

13. Which of the following have you visited either on this trip or previously?
(If yes) How would you rate this on a scale of 1 to 5, with 5 being excellent
and 1 being poor? (If no) Why didn't you visit (do) this?

Reasons for Not Visiting:

- 1 = not interested
2 = didn't know about it
3 = no time
4 = costs too much
5 = couldn't find it
6 = plan to visit later
7 = other - write in reason

	<u>Yes</u>	<u>No</u>	<u>(If yes:)</u> <u>Rating</u>	<u>(If no:)</u> <u>Reason</u>
RCMP Centennial Museum	_____	_____	1 2 3 4 5	_____
Museum of Natural History	_____	_____	1 2 3 4 5	_____
Norman MacKenzie Art Gallery	_____	_____	1 2 3 4 5	_____
Plains Historic Museum	_____	_____	1 2 3 4 5	_____
SPC Observation Deck	_____	_____	1 2 3 4 5	_____
Wascana Center	_____	_____	1 2 3 4 5	_____
Diefenbaker Homestead	_____	_____	1 2 3 4 5	_____
Willow Island	_____	_____	1 2 3 4 5	_____
Legislative Building	_____	_____	1 2 3 4 5	_____
Saskatchewan Sports Hall of Fame	_____	_____	1 2 3 4 5	_____
Government House	_____	_____	1 2 3 4 5	_____
Downtown Regina	_____	_____	1 2 3 4 5	_____
Saskatchewan Roughrider Game	_____	_____	1 2 3 4 5	_____
The Trial of Louis Riel	_____	_____	1 2 3 4 5	_____
Ipsco Animal Park	_____	_____	1 2 3 4 5	_____
Saskatchewan Center of the Arts	_____	_____	1 2 3 4 5	_____
Shopping	_____	_____	1 2 3 4 5	_____
Swimming Pools	_____	_____	1 2 3 4 5	_____
Picnic Areas	_____	_____	1 2 3 4 5	_____
Qu'Appelle Valley	_____	_____	1 2 3 4 5	_____
Regina Beach	_____	_____	1 2 3 4 5	_____
Other Regina Facilities				
(specify:)	_____	_____	1 2 3 4 5	_____
	_____	_____	1 2 3 4 5	_____
	_____	_____	1 2 3 4 5	_____

14. On a scale of 1 to 5, with 5 being excellent, and 1 being poor, how would you rate the following:

(If a rating of 2 or less is received, ask why dissatisfied)

						Don't Know not Applicable
Quality of Accommodation	1	2	3	4	5	6
Variety of Accommodation	1	2	3	4	5	6
Cost of Accommodation	1	2	3	4	5	6
Quality of Restaurants	1	2	3	4	5	6
Variety of Restaurants	1	2	3	4	5	6
Cost of Restaurants	1	2	3	4	5	6
Variety of Museums/Art Galleries	1	2	3	4	5	6
Quality of Museums/Art Galleries	1	2	3	4	5	6
Variety of Recreation Facilities	1	2	3	4	5	6
Quality of Recreation Facilities	1	2	3	4	5	6
Variety of Shopping Facilities	1	2	3	4	5	6
Tourist Facilities in General	1	2	3	4	5	6
Hospitality and Courtesy in General	1	2	3	4	5	6
Road/Highways	1	2	3	4	5	6
Airport	1	2	3	4	5	6
Bus Terminal	1	2	3	4	5	6

(explanation of poor ratings:)

15. How would you rate the following statements on a scale of 1 to 5, with 5 being strongly agree and 1 being strongly disagree.

	Don't Know Not Applicable	Strongly Disagree				Strongly Agree
Tourist information is easy to get	0	1	2	3	4	5
Tourist information booths are easy to find	0	1	2	3	4	5
It is easy to find my way around the City	0	1	2	3	4	5
There is enough parking downtown	0	1	2	3	4	5
There are enough public washrooms downtown	0	1	2	3	4	5
The people of Regina are helpful to visitors	0	1	2	3	4	5
I plan to visit Regina again	0	1	2	3	4	5

****GO TO QUESTION 28.**

(GIVE RESPONDENT THIS QUESTION TO FILL IN)

16. Which of the following have you visited either on this trip or previously?
(If yes) How would you rate this on a scale of 1 to 5, with 5 being excellent
and 1 being poor? (If no) Why didn't you visit (do) this?

Reasons for Not Visiting:

- 1 = not interested
2 = didn't know about it
3 = no time
4 = costs too much
5 = couldn't find it
6 = plan to visit later
7 = other - write in reason

	<u>Yes</u>	<u>No</u>	(If yes:) <u>Rating</u>	(If no:) <u>Reason</u>
RCMP Centennial Museum	___	___	1 2 3 4 5	___
Museum of Natural History	___	___	1 2 3 4 5	___
Norman MacKenzie Art Gallery	___	___	1 2 3 4 5	___
Plains Historic Museum	___	___	1 2 3 4 5	___
SPC Observation Deck	___	___	1 2 3 4 5	___
Wascana Center	___	___	1 2 3 4 5	___
Diefenbaker Homestead	___	___	1 2 3 4 5	___
Willow Island	___	___	1 2 3 4 5	___
Legislative Building	___	___	1 2 3 4 5	___
Saskatchewan Sports Hall of Fame	___	___	1 2 3 4 5	___
Government House	___	___	1 2 3 4 5	___
Downtown Regina	___	___	1 2 3 4 5	___
Saskatchewan Roughrider Game	___	___	1 2 3 4 5	___
The Trial of Louis Riel	___	___	1 2 3 4 5	___
Ipsco Animal Park	___	___	1 2 3 4 5	___
Saskatchewan Center of the Arts	___	___	1 2 3 4 5	___
Shopping	___	___	1 2 3 4 5	___
Swimming Pools	___	___	1 2 3 4 5	___
Picnic Areas	___	___	1 2 3 4 5	___
Qu'Appelle Valley	___	___	1 2 3 4 5	___
Regina Beach	___	___	1 2 3 4 5	___
Other Regina Facilities				
(specify:)	___	___	1 2 3 4 5	___
	___	___	1 2 3 4 5	___
	___	___	1 2 3 4 5	___

17. What type of accommodation did you use while in Regina? (Check only one -- the type used most often)

- ☐ home of friends/relatives
☐ hotel/motel/inn
☐ campground/trailer park
☐ private cabin/cottage
☐ commercial cabin/cottage
☐ other (specify:) _____

18. On a scale of 1 to 5, with 5 being excellent, and 1 being poor, how would you rate the following:

(If a rating of 2 or less is received, ask why dissatisfied)

	1	2	3	4	5	Don't Know not Applicable
Quality of Accommodation						6
Variety of Accommodation						6
Cost of Accommodation						6
Quality of Restaurants						6
Variety of Restaurants						6
Cost of Restaurants						6
Variety of Museums/Art Galleries						6
Quality of Museums/Art Galleries						6
Variety of Recreation Facilities						6
Quality of Recreation Facilities						6
Variety of Shopping Facilities						6
Tourist Facilities in General						6
Hospitality and Courtesy in General						6
Road/Highways						6
Airport						6
Bus Terminal						6
(explanation of poor ratings:)	_____					

19. (Ask only if visitor is from outside of Saskatchewan. If visitor is from Saskatchewan go to question 20.)
How many trips in total did you take to Saskatchewan in the past twelve months?
_____ trips (If zero trips go to question 21.)
20. How many trips did you take to Regina in the past twelve months?
_____ trips
21. How many trips that were 80 km (50 miles) or longer have you taken in the past twelve months?
_____ trips
22. Have you visited Regina before?
_____ yes
_____ no
23. From where did you get information about Regina? (Do not read. Can check more than one).
_____ lived here before
_____ friends/relatives
_____ hotel/motel/campground
_____ automobile or travel association
_____ tourist information centres
_____ newspaper/magazines
_____ other (specify:) _____
_____ didn't get information
24. How would you rate the following statements on a scale of 1 to 5, with 5 being strongly agree and 1 being strongly disagree.

	Don't Know Not Applicable	Strongly Disagree				Strongly Agree
Tourist information is easy to get	0	1	2	3	4	5
Tourist information booths are easy to find	0	1	2	3	4	5
It is easy to find my way around the City	0	1	2	3	4	5
There is enough parking downtown	0	1	2	3	4	5
There are enough public washrooms downtown	0	1	2	3	4	5
The people of Regina are helpful to visitors	0	1	2	3	4	5
I plan to visit Regina again	0	1	2	3	4	5

25. Your answers to the next few questions will be kept confidential. The information will only be released in a statistical and anonymous way.

About how much money will you and other members of your party spend in total while on this trip? Please include credit card purchases.

\$ _____

26. About how much money will be spent in Regina by your party while on this trip?

\$ _____

27. Of your party's expenditures in Regina, how much will be spent on the following:

\$

Accommodation

Restaurant meals and beverages

Food and beverages from stores

Entertainment/recreation

Shopping and gifts

Transportation costs while in Regina (including all gas and oil purchases in Regina).

Other (Specify:)

(Check to see if sum equals amount in question 26. If different, ask which one is accurate: question 26 _____ or question 27 _____.)

28. How many people are in your travel party?

_____ people

** (If respondent answered questions 25 to 27, ask:)

- 28 a. So the expense information applies to _____ people? (revise if not correct).

29. How could your party best be described?

_____ travelling alone

_____ family

_____ friends

_____ business associates

_____ other (specify) _____

30. What is the age and sex of all people in your travel party starting with yourself?

<u>Age</u>	<u>Sex</u>	<u>Age</u>	<u>Sex</u>	<u>Age</u>	<u>Sex</u>	<u>Age</u>	<u>Sex</u>	<u>Age</u>	<u>Sex</u>
—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—

31. What is the occupation of the primary wage earner in your household?

32. For statistical purposes, which of the following categories contains the total 1981 income from all members of your household before taxes and deductions?

Category _____

Refused _____

33. (If interviewed at RCMP Museum or near Cornwall Centre, ask)
By what mode of travel did you arrive in Regina? (Read choices. Check only one.)

_____ motor vehicle

_____ bus

_____ aeroplane

_____ train

_____ other (specify) _____

34. Do you have any comments you would like to make about Regina?

THANK RESPONDENT FOR HELP.

APPENDIX II

Additional Comments Volunteered by Respondents

<u>Comment</u>	<u>Number</u>
A. <u>ABOUT THE CITY IN GENERAL</u>	
Regina is a nice/beautiful City	296
The water is terrible	106
Regina is a clean city	80
The people are friendly/very nice	59
The trees and parks are nice	30
Regina is getting better	14
I had a good time	13
Regina is okay/not bad	13
The weather is great	13
Regina is a nice small City	10
Lots of nice old buildings	10
I'll visit Regina again	9
The City is dirty	9
I would like to live here	8
The crime rate is high	8
Advertise the City more	7
I would like to stay longer	7
Regina is a progressive City	7
The City is too small	6
Regina is big	6
There is a lot of greenery	6
The City is very flat	5
Not as nice as Saskatoon	5
People are not friendly	5
Wascana is nice	4
Good City planning	4
A quiet City	4
Needs more trees	3
City is boring	3
I like the Prairies	3

<u>Comment</u>	<u>Number</u>
Take more pride in this City	3
A nice place for seniors	3
Almost as good as Saskatoon	3
Entrance to City is nice	2
I wouldn't want to live here	2
Regina is a hectic/busy City	2
Weather is bad (hot/dry)	2
I hate Regina	2
Exchange rate problems	2
Need more City maps	2
Cozy City	1
Hasn't changed in years	1
Bad planning with Ipsco and refineries so close	1
Improve the liquor laws	1
Regina is getting bigger	1
I don't want to come back	1
Safe City	1
Hard to think of Regina as a tourist area	1
I always get parking tickets in Regina	1
Regina is behind the times	1
A good place to find a job	1
A bad place to find a job	1
Growing too fast	1
Expand Victoria Mall	1
Took some water as a souvenir	1
Regina is falling behind in everything	1

<u>Comment</u>	<u>Number</u>
B. <u>ABOUT FACILITIES</u>	
Overall high prices in Regina	13
Need City campgrounds or closer campgrounds	11
City needs more to do	5
Need a major tourist attraction	5
Need small shops, boutiques	5
Needs more nightclubs	4
Good shopping facilities	4
Need tourist information at bus station	4
Need tourist information at train station	3
Need telephones downtown	3
Good hospital/medical services	3
Good football team	3
Get a better football team	3
Need more picnic areas	2
Legislative Building is beautiful	2
Need trailer dump station	2
Lots to see and do	2
Lots of bad mosquitos	2
Like Cornwall Centre	2
Poor service in restaurants	2
Nice golf courses	2
Need tourist facilities at airport	2
Good restaurants	2
Good accommodation	2
Improve quality of malls	2
Needs more shopping places	1
Needs mountains	1
Needs a rifle range	1
Needs rest areas	1
No diet soft drinks	1
Need a water slide	1
Ipsco is free!	1

<u>Comment</u>	<u>Number</u>
Need bed and breakfast places	1
Need more outdoor swimming pools	1
Need a large sports complex	1
Need permanent tourist booths	1
RCMP Museum is great	1
Need monument to T.C. Douglas	1
More recreation facilities required	1
Put tourist information at Legislative Building and Museum	1
Need restaurants in east end of City	1
Like the churches	1
Can't find souvenirs	1
Need information in French	1
Too many banks	1
Folk festival was good	1
Need more young girls	1
Restaurants closed Sundays	1
Bars are good	1
Have Trial of Louis Riel on Saturday evenings	1
Information booth personnel couldn't answer my questions	1
Clean the Centre of the Arts	1
Needs more of everything	1
No tourist information in hotel	1
Couldn't get into observation platform at Wascana Authority Building	1

<u>Comment</u>	<u>Number</u>
C. <u>ABOUT TRANSPORTATION</u>	
Streets need fixing	45
Airport needs better eating/drinking facilities	8
Easy to find my way around Regina	5
Traffic/street signs hard to find/follow	5
Bad drivers	5
Washrooms in bus station are very dirty	5
Don't like one-way streets	3
Good drivers	3
Need signs to points of interest	3
Need more to do in airport	3
Poor parking	3
Don't like the traffic system	2
Narrow streets	2
Bad cab drivers	2
Unkempt cab drivers	2
Need cabs at the airport	2
No. 1 East highway is poor	2
Don't like the road changes	1
Hard to find my way around Regina	1
Street signs are too small	1
Flight times aren't good	1
Traffic lights are good	1
Poor place for hitch-hikers	1
Nice airport	1
Like Albert Street	1
Bus is too far from train station	1
Wide streets	1
Ring road is good	1
Good transportation network in City	1
Train station needs lights	1

<u>Comment</u>	<u>Number</u>
Parking too expensive	1
Highway 39 is poor	1
Poor highway to U.S.	1
No. 6 highway is terrible	1
Good gas prices	1
Highway to Saskatoon is poor	1
Poor road signs on Highway 33	1
Need a better road to Moose Jaw	1
Not many facilities between Manitoba and Regina	1



POOR

QUALITY

ORIGINAL

